

Before I do that, I see the chairman of the subcommittee is here. I ask Senator BOND if he has anything further to say insofar as the highway bill is concerned.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the chairman, the good Senator from Oklahoma. He is doing a wonderful job. I have been listening to the comments of our friend from Arizona and I understand his concerns. In order to achieve equity, in order to get the bill passed, we were only able to give certain States, under the formula, an increase that maybe in all rights was not adequate. But anybody who gets a 40-percent increase is certainly doing better than most.

I have driven the highways in Arizona, and I know that my colleague from Arizona does an excellent job representing his State. I hope the additional \$1.118 billion will be a help.

This is a problem we always face on the highway bill. I don't know any State that cannot make a compelling case that they have needs that are greater. The chairman of the full committee and I are sitting on the first or second and third worst roads and the first and second worst bridges in the Nation. I am not getting a 40-percent increase. I can tell you in detail about friends who have been killed on the highways in Missouri because there was too much traffic—10,000, 15,000 cars a day on narrow two-lane roads. This is a huge problem.

The State of Oklahoma is a major Southwest-to-Midwest freeway. My State is in the center of the States. When you look at a map that shows the truck traffic and you identify the major corridors by red lines, the center of Missouri is a big red spot, and St. Louis is a big red blotch on the map; there is that much congestion.

We were very proud to have the first interstate in the Nation under President Eisenhower's bill, starting through St. Charles, MO. That is the good news. But the bad news is that the road is badly out of shape, and there is not enough money in this highway bill even to make a beginning on repairing it. The Missouri Department of Transportation may be able to make some improvements. We are giving them some options on how to deal with it in our State, but it is clearly a pressing need.

I can make a case that Missouri is the demographic center, because as many people live north of us as south of us, and as many people live east of us as west of us. The national traffic flow is through the State. We have needs. We don't increase at 40 percent, but we had to stay with the funding formula because this is a compromise. We are trying to take care of everyone and meet the needs that are pressing, meet the highest priority needs, and we were not able to do it.

We want to work with our good friend from Arizona. We understand his concerns and we thank him for his kind comments. Again, I will have to say

that the effort we put in was a lengthy effort and much compromise—nobody got really all they need, which, unfortunately, is the nature of a compromise.

Again, I appreciate the comments made. I hope all of us can get together and move quickly. We are ready to offer an amendment. I gather we are urged to wait until tomorrow morning. If others have amendments, I hope we can be open for business tomorrow and get going because there are lots of pressing amendments and there are issues that need to be voted on. I hope we can get up and running and begin a very important debate and have votes on these amendments. I thank the Senator.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri. I also would like to say that it has been a very difficult task developing this legislation. While it seems as though all some colleagues want to talk about is the formula in terms of money, there are many other issues we dealt with—environmental issues, streamlining issues, safety issues, issues that are of paramount concern to everyone. A compromise was made on all of those issues—some I don't like, but we did compromise.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. CORZINE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oklahoma will allow for 20 minutes speaking as in morning business.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I amend that to up to 20 minutes for the first speaker and 10 minutes thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORZINE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I, too, respect very much the challenges the chairman of the committee and the ranking member have been able to work through. I look forward to a good, healthy debate about some of the specifics. I think we are on the right track.

INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak on an issue about which I have spoken a number of times and which I passionately believe needs to be addressed—frankly, it is one that is well past the maturation stage where it should have been addressed—and that is an independent look at our intelligence operations, particularly as they relate to the pre-Iraqi invasion and how conclusions were drawn, so that can speak to the American people about the facts we had.

It is an issue which I think is essential to the national security of the American people. If we don't learn from our mistakes, we are bound to make those mistakes again. It is high time we have gotten around to it.

In the past few days, the administration and the world have come to understand and acknowledge on a broad basis the colossal intelligence failures that led us to war, a war that may have led to good ends, but the Nation clearly didn't come to those conclusions on the basis of the information we now seem to be discovering.

There is a question about means to an end that I think is pretty simple in the kinds of discussions I think all of us have in the families and in the communities in which we live. I don't think we want to get into a position where means justify ends when they don't relate to them. I just point that out as some of this discussion has evolved.

On January 8, Secretary of State Colin Powell addressed the lack of connection between Iraq and al-Qaida, stating:

I've not seen a smoking gun, concrete evidence about that connection.

We were told something different.

Then the President, in his latest State of the Union Address, referred only to weapons of mass destruction and related program activities, whatever that is—a far cry from the active nuclear program and stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons warned of in his last State of the Union Message in 2003.

It was last week's testimony from David Kay, the man responsible for the weapons search in Iraq, that finally brought this matter to maturity and captured the attention of the Nation, the administration, and the world, and that has really changed the whole context of this debate and discussion.

Dr. Kay, a man who told us last fall that Iraq's nuclear programs were only at the most rudimentary level, told the Senate Armed Services Committee there was no evidence of stockpiles of chemical or biological weapons.

David Kay has made an important recommendation—one that I think has been obvious for a number of months—that an independent inquiry be established so that the American people, so that the allies of the United States and those who would work with us, so that all of us who are involved in policy-making know we have the facts that allow us to make good decisions so that we are not committing the lives of our men and women in our military to efforts that are based on false premises, whether those are intentional or unintentional.

We need to have the right answers, and that recommendation apparently has now led—some might say forced—the President to announce he will name a panel to look at the intelligence issues related to Iraq.

I welcome the President's reversal on this critical need, and I suspect we will